



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,612	07/02/2003	Marvin Ruffin	03120057	4756

26565 7590 09/09/2005

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
P.O. BOX 2828
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2828

EXAMINER

MAY, ROBERT J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,612

Applicant(s)

RUFFIN ET AL.

Examiner

Robert May

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 15-20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/2/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13, 15-17, & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dietz (US Pat 2,293,597). Dietz discloses in Figure 2 a magnifying lens with a semi-cylindrical front surface (25), a back surface with an indentation or channel (11), a top and bottom reflecting angled and curved surface 12 (Pg 1, Lines 55-57), which are shown to be quadrilaterally symmetrical to each other in Figure 2. The reflecting surfaces are coated with a silvering solution, which is inherently specularly reflective.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz. Dietz does not explicitly disclose a face on the reflecting surface (12) but it is generally obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify the angled curved surfaces (12) to have a faceted angled surface for a reflecting surface in order to direct the light in particular direction which is notoriously known in the art. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reflecting surfaces (12) of Dietz with faceted surfaces in order to direct the light in a particular direction.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Morton (US Pat 3,883,731). Dietz discloses all of the claimed features of 13, but does not disclose an evaporated aluminum on the reflecting surfaces (12). However, Morton discloses depositing an aluminum coating on a surface in order to make it reflective. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to coat the reflective surfaces of Dietz with an Aluminum coating in order to make it reflective.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Colbert (US Pat 2,390,424). Dietz discloses all of the claimed features of 13, but does not disclose a chromium layer added to the reflecting surfaces (12). However, Colbert discloses depositing a chromium layer on areflective surface in order to make it reflective, hard, and scratch resistant (Pg 4, Lines 66-68). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to coat the reflective surfaces of Dietz with a Chromium layer in order to make it reflective and scratch resistant.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-12 are allowed.

Claims 14 & 21 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reasons for Indicating Allowable Subject Matter

In regard to Claim 1, the prior art does not teach a directed light source with a planar substrate with a top and bottom surface and a light-emitting device located on the top surface of the substrate.

In regard to Claim 14, the prior art does not teach or suggest a reflector as claimed in Claim 13 with a toroidal lens on the semi-cylindrical front surface.

In regard to Claim 21, the prior art does not teach or suggest a reflector as claimed in Claim 13, with an aperture on the semi-cylindrical surface.


Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Muraki (4,630,180) discloses an LED array with a semi-cylindrical lens. Golz (6,670,763) discloses a reflective surface with a chromium layer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert May whose telephone number is (571) 272-5919. The examiner can normally be reached between 9 am– 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for all communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval PAIR system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800